

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

AMANDA B. CHRISTMAN	:	CIVIL ACTION
<i>Plaintiff</i>	:	
	:	NO. 18-2434
v.	:	
	:	
NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting	:	
Commissioner of the Social Security	:	
Administration	:	
<i>Defendant</i>	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 21st day of February 2019, upon consideration of the *Report and Recommendation* (the “R&R”) issued on January 29, 2019, by the Honorable Marilyn Heffley, United States Magistrate Judge (“the Magistrate Judge”), [ECF 15], and after an independent review of the record, this Court concurs with the Magistrate Judge’s conclusion that the findings of fact and conclusions of law, as determined by the Administrative Law Judge in this matter, are supported by substantial evidence.¹ Consequently, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. The R&R is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**.
2. Plaintiff’s Request for Review is **DENIED**.
3. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), the decision of the Acting Commissioner of Social Security is **AFFIRMED**.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Nitza I. Quiñones Alejandro
NITZA I. QUIÑONES ALEJANDRO
Judge, United States District Court

¹ Neither Plaintiff nor the Acting Commissioner filed any objection and/or response to the R&R. In the absence of any objections, this Court reviewed the R&R under the “plain error” standard. *See Facyson v. Barnhart*, 2003 WL 22436274, at *2 (E.D. Pa. May 30, 2003). Under this plain error standard of review, an R&R should only be rejected if the magistrate judge commits an error that was “(1) clear or obvious, (2) affect[ed] ‘substantial rights,’ and (3) seriously affected the fairness, integrity or public reputation of judicial proceedings.” *Leyva v. Williams*, 504 F.3d 357, 363 (3d Cir. 2007) (internal quotations and citations omitted). Here, after a thorough review of the record and the R&R, this Court finds no error and, therefore, adopts the R&R in its entirety.